

Date: Tue, 27 Jul 93 01:43:57 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #261  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 27 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    261

Today's Topics:

    1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs. (3 msgs)  
        1947 No Code Survey: Results???  
        ARRL and it's members (3 msgs)  
    ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...) (2 msgs)  
        Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code )  
            Give a VE \$5.60, walk  
            Real CBers  
        Sony world band radio for sale

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 26 Jul 93 09:40:23 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com (Rev. Michael P. Deignan)  
writes:

>>Isn't it strange how The League has ignored this fact. Oh well, so much  
>>for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in  
>>Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.

>Not to actually defend the League (gosh, I wouldn't want people to get the  
>wrong idea...)  
><factual defense of ARRL deleted>.



I have tried to stay on the sidelines during this thread, but now I must speak out. The League's proposal would not have given 2-meter privileges to codefree Techs. And the League has been taking a beating in some quarters for that. Go figure.

Read through QST and the other ham magazines the last few years, and observe how the League has lead the way in publishing usable, reproducible UHF and microwave projects. Take note of the number of VHF, UHF and microwave operating events sponsored by the League. Then consider the awards offered to stimulate activity on the UHF and microwave bands. Which amateur organization is trying to help AMSAT develop the Phase 3 satellite? ARRL.

People are people all over the world, and people sometimes take the easy way out. Some hams are hams because they want to talk to other people. They are more likely to find people to talk to on crowded bands, so that's where they hang out. Newcomers shouldn't be forced into radio isolation, just because most of the 150,000 hams who were licensed before codefree came along aren't any more interested in operating 23-cm FM than they are. Hams have been staying away from the microwave bands in droves for years. It didn't start with the codefree license, so why blame codefree licensees? If we oldtimers had led the way by building and using UHF and microwave repeaters, manufacturers would be making less-expensive equipment, which would allow more newcomers to operate those bands, and limit congestion on 2 meters. We're more to blame than they are!

If there was a great need for frequencies where technically adept people could communicate, technically adept people would become hams. The fact that the entire memberships of IEEE, ACM and SMPTE aren't flocking to VE sessions should tell us something.

Here's what we have: Somewhere around 100,000 new hams in the last few years. Maybe you don't consider them to be hams, but the FCC does, and their opinion matters more than yours. You can do one of three things:

1. Ignore them and hope they go away
2. Thrash away at them
3. Encourage them to develop into your ideal of what hams should be

Personally, I find it more pleasant and usually more effective

to try to get along with people. For that reason, I would feel better about the future of my hobby if this thread would take the direction of "How can we integrate these newcomers into ham radio the way we see it?"

One way is to set a good example. Talking derisively about someone because he or she uses different prosigns is neither productive, mature or sensible. You don't impress anyone by blustering about how much more superior your operation is. Those newcomers are communicating and having fun. Isn't it better to join them than to fight them?

--

jkearman@arrl.org

>for representation. By the way, virtually all Codeless Techs, here in  
>Houston at least, have headed straight for Two Meters.

>

>Ten Forty Roger, and all those Good Numbers!

>

> --Robert

>

-----

Date: 26 Jul 93 13:36:35 GMT

From: gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!newsserver.jvnc.net!newsserver.egr.uri.edu!  
orca!swamik@RUTGERS.EDU

Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Some idiot wrote:

>Attn. Rev. turkey there is no license called CodelessTech!!!

>Why in the hell should I learn 13 wpm Moris to work the satellites?

>Rev Rod     Universal Life Church (I payed \$1 in 1970 for the Rev. part)

>My rev is just as good as your rev but I an not such a big JERK.

Calm down!!!!!!   ..\_   .. \_... .. \_\_\_ \_ .-.-.-

Someone else wrote:

>What's really interesting about being a no-coder on 2m is that there is  
>an unending stream of old farts with holier-than-thou attitudes who make the  
>band sound like CB by going on about 10-40 roger and all the good numbers.

>I've never heard anything CB-ish uttered by anyone other than a VE3xx (that's  
>a full priv advanced class license with 10+ years). Seems that it must  
>be the code types that have the CB problem.

>Perhaps if the old-farts-with-attitude spent some of their time doing  
>constructive things like HELPING PEOPLE LEARN CODE, rather than running  
>people down for not having the precious code, more people might learn it. On  
>the other hand, when they sit back and bitch about no-coders, they sound  
>just like the brain-dead goons on CB going on about how tough they are.

\_\_\_ ..... \_'\_\_ .. ... .. \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

What is this? rec.radio.amateur.flame.flame.flame!  
I sure hope no non- or prospective hams are reading all this crap!

KB1AMB/AA

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 15:12:16 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 1947 No Code Survey: Results???  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>  
> What is this? rec.radio.amateur.flame.flame.flame!  
> I sure hope no non- or prospective hams are reading all this crap!

Au contraire: I hope they are!  
This will give them an indication of what "real" hams are like ...

And just where \*are\* the results of this survey? \_Must\_ be the ARRL  
hidin' 'em. Yeah, that's it.

Have a safe and super fine one.

Peter Laws | "The '90s are gonna make the '60s|plaws@uafhp.uark.edu  
n5uwy@ka5bml.ar.usa.noam| look like the '50s" --D. Hopper|plaws@uafsysb.bitnet

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 10:47:35 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:  
>First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights  
>as to the ARRL's activities.

Ron, I have to respectfully disagree. Everyone has a right to complain.  
And I, for one, sure don't want to ignore any quarter from which good  
ideas may spring, including from nonmembers.

-----  
Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org  
American Radio Relay League |  
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 12:17:09 GMT  
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!  
robert@RUTGERS.EDU  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:  
>  
>  
> <message deleted>  
>  
> Let me get this straight Ron...  
>  
> The League goes out under the premise of representing the entire  
> Amateur Community. But if I don't want them to represent me, I still have  
> to send them \$30 to SUPPORT these ideas of which I wanted no part in the  
> first place????? THEN I can voice my dissent.  
>  
> As the Reverend so beautifully put it: Bullshit.

Now that The League has made it known that they are Internet and Usenet  
connections, I'd like to see THEIR response to this. Enquiring minds want

to know!

--Robert

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 10:38:03 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL and it's members  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

>ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>> First off, if you're not a league member, you got no bitching rights  
>> as to the ARRL's activities.

I have already stated my opinion on this; being or not being a League member in now way affects someone's right to voice dissent. In fact, I encourage people to lay the cards on the table and let us know clearly what they think about the things we do or don't do.

>The fact is that there is a lot od  
>disillusion regarding the ARRL, and I sure would hope to see another  
>organization rise up and represent the hams who don't think the ARRL is  
>representing them.

Speaking of laying cards on the table, I have seen this sentiment posted by a few in the current ARRL is good/bad thread, but the specifics have been missing. I would like to ask the following:

Do you feel that there is nothing that the ARRL has done in the past few years that represents you?

Or, do you feel that our actions on one or more specific issues have been against what you feel to be your best interests?

I am sincere -- I would like to see the grievances aired. I think I can point out quite a few things that we have done that have helped most hams, amateurs, so I suspect that most anti-ARRL sentiment is probably based on the second issue.

73, Ed

-----  
Ed Hare, KA1CV  
ehare@arrl.org

American Radio Relay League  
225 Main St.  
Newington, CT 06111  
(203) 666-1541 - voice  
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor  
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing  
-----

"You will never put the puzzle together  
if you keep putting all of the pieces  
back in the box." Colleen

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 09:49:22 EDT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, jherndo@eis.calstate.edu (John Herndon) writes:  
>Well, stop taking it out of "the back pockets" of ARRL members. As quite  
>a few of us have seen, the ARRL is now connected to the Internet. Drop  
>the DIRECT connection, and save several thousand dollars a month.

Well. This is the first time we've been dinged for being \*too well\*  
connected to the Internet. Congratulations! You win the award for  
coming up with a new complaint.

In fact, we pay something in the neighborhood of \$2000 \*per year\* for  
our dial-up connection. \*I\* feel that the additional service we are  
able to provide to our members is more than worth that amount.

>That's meant more of a poke in the side than anything. But it cues a  
>question, Why is the ARRL online? Why not just hookup to a mail/usenet  
>server.

We used to be connected through a uucp connection to a local university.  
The unreliability of that connection is what drove us to a paid-for  
connection in the first place.

>Is there a possible expansion in mind?

We hope to one day provide some FTP access, as well as a better mail  
connection. We are presently waiting for our service provider to  
upgrade the capabilities at its Hartford POP. Then we may upgrade  
the connection somewhat. (No firm decision has been made, though.)  
-----

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org  
American Radio Relay League |  
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111



Date: 26 Jul 1993 15:41:48 GMT  
From: swrinde!sdd.hp.com!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!cs.umd.edu!  
skates.gsfc.nasa.gov!NewsWatcher!user@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jon, you forgot one important justification! I would hope your publication, the coulm editors and staff the the info flows from read the BBS and have a sense of feed back real time. What the concerns are? What the response to issues are? What are the issues? Problems? This should be a real time feed back loop for QST and the its commercial support.  
This is from a long non member, but reader. PS , I used to swap read CQ with QST! Last issue seen was April of this year. The ARRL bulletins are nice, I would never see other wise! Just abt. to put WWI to abt 1968 issues on BBS for sale. Dick W1DGA

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 23:47:00 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!darwin.sura.net!uvaarpa!pplace!  
pat.wilson@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code )  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

->  
-> And I'm sick of people telling me I \_must\_ learn code.  
->  
-> What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?  
-> What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?  
-> Not much.

No one is telling you that you \_must\_ learn code. But you damned well better learn it if you want to work other bands.

It has nothing to do with building anything. It is a test designed to make you study and learn. Nothing else. So, either learn it and pass or complain and wait for the rules to change for you. Either way, good luck on the codeless tech and welcome to 2 meters. (grin)

Let me know when you pass and I will see if I can work you long distance. Course, you don't even have to pass a test to use the telephone, too bad.

N0RDQ

-----

Date: 26 Jul 93 12:46:00 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!uvaarpa!pplace!  
pat.wilson@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-> BTW, while I don't actively advertise it, I'm:  
->  
-> Bishop Anthony S. Pelliccio (Rev. Deignan is in my diocese)  
->  
-> Tony

AND.....

Pat

NORDQ

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 05:35:33 GMT  
From: cthomas@athena.mit.edu  
Subject: Real CBers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CAso2z.F7H@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

>  
>-.. . -.- .... .---- .- -- .... -... .- .-  
>

-.-. --- -. --. .- .- ... --- -. - ..... . ..- .--. --. .- .- --.. .  
-. . .-- --.. ----- -.-.

--Michael T. Ford  
cthomas@MIT.edu  
wz0c@wz0c.ampr.org  
wz0c@wa1phy.#ema.ma.usa

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 14:49:48 GMT  
From: gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!

umn.edu!msus1.msus.edu!vax1.mankato.msus.edu!bayern@RUTGERS.EDU  
Subject: Sony world band radio for sale  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Sony World Band Radio model ICF-SW7600 for sale.

one year old and almost brand new.

Crutchfield's mail order price : 229.95

10-key direct access tuning to all bands, manual and automatic scan tuning  
sleep timer.  
come with AC adapter, earphone , complete manual and a book of short wave  
stations of the world( with time table )

I'm asking for \$150.00 obo.

bayern@vax1.mankato.msus.edu

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 14:32:57 GMT  
From: world!ksr!jfw%ksr.com@decwrl.dec.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1786@arrl.org>, <23JUL199307025189@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,  
<CAq72H.4r0@dartvax.dartmouth.edu>  
Subject : Re: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

Kenneth.E.Harker@Dartmouth.Edu (Kenneth E. Harker) writes:  
>In article <23JUL199307025189@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>  
>stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov (ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:  
>> This process at all levels is still !!!!! TOO !!!!! manual. It appears as  
>> if the belief is that a manual process is the only way to ensure accuracy  
>> and validity.  
> Exactly! I am getting into amateur radio mainly for the digital  
>modes now available.

The problem of validation is not one to take lightly; surely someone as excited  
as yourselves over the use of computers have heard of computer crackers and  
other forms of digital malfeasance. Check out the name in the header of my  
article here; is that REALLY my name?

However, the FCC is not entirely backward; they \_have\_ issued preliminary  
regulations to allow electronic filing, contingent (largely) on a federally-  
approved standard for digital signatures and other authentication. That is  
\_not\_ a simple problem, and it is one that the people out there in the cold,  
cruel, real world take seriously.

John, WB7EEL

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 05:25:35 GMT  
From: portal!ttolh@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1823@arrl.org>, <26JUL199311552066@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>,  
<DEM.93Jul26142139@devil.meaddata.com>  
Subject : Re: ARRL Internet connection (was: Re: STILL waiting ...)

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, jherndo@eis.calstate.edu (John Herndon) writes:

> Well, stop taking it out of "the back pockets" of ARRL members. As quite  
> a few of us have seen, the ARRL is now connected to the Internet. Drop  
> the DIRECT connection, and save several thousand dollars a month.

Ya just can't please some people.

Keep upgrading your connectivity, ARRL. Some of us actually  
appreciate it, although it might be hard to discred that through  
all the habitual bitching.

--

Todd Tolhurst, WA1M    \\  
Waterbury, CT            \\   CAUTION: Engage brain before running mouth  
ttolh@shell.portal.com    \\

-----  
Date: 26 Jul 93 04:28:33 GMT  
From: amusing!goldmine!elt@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <16JUL199308062528@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>, <CAHCHC.C71@news.Hawaii.Edu>,  
<1993Jul21.153004.145877@locus.com>  
Subject : Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

In article <1993Jul21.153004.145877@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana H.  
Myers) writes:

>  
> ... thread thinned ...

>  
>While it is true many people can learn CW, much like many people can  
>learn to play the piano, Erich does have a valid point. It appears  
>that people who do not know CW are viewed as lesser people by the  
>morse fanatics. It is effectively a prejudice. It would seem that

>"morse fanatics" automatically assume that a person that doesn't  
>know Morse code is lazy or wants something for free.  
>  
>\*You\* may not feel this way, but this is an attitude I've frequently  
>seen among the people I regard as "morse fanatics". This attitude is  
>not friendly, and effectively is the same as a racial or ethnic bigotry.

Yeah, but when the old farts die, no one will care... I hear the DX'ers  
put down the FM'ers, contesters put down rag chewers, paper chaisers  
put down the chatter-boxer's, microwaver's but down HF'ers. "If you  
don't work [insert your favorite mode here,] your just a lid..."

Me? I just can't see why more people don't work ATV! ;-)

--

Ed Taychert (AA2MZ) | Never be good at anything you don't like doing.  
elt@irony.com | Disclaimer: My boss doesn't know I use his computer.

-----

Date: 26 Jul 93 13:21:00 GMT  
From: cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jane.uh.edu!st2cm@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul23.122412.19994@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,  
<22ovicINNju2@topaz.bds.com>, <930725.130411.9t0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>  
Subject : Re: ARRL and it's members

In article <930725.130411.9t0.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com>, system@garlic.sbs.com  
(Tony Pelliccio) writes...

>ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>>

>> The ARRL is a representative organization. Bitch and moan about it all you  
>> want, it couldn't operate except as it does. It is not any different than  
>> any other business or non-profit organization, with the possible exception  
>> that the bulk of the organization is not paid.

>>

Does this mean that all those guys at League Headquarters work for free?  
Enquiring minds want to know!

--Robert

-----

Date: 26 Jul 93 12:38:27 GMT  
From: uwm.edu!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!  
IASTATE.EDU!wjturner@RUTGERS.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul25.001710.5168@anomaly.sbs.com>,  
<5FJ97B2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <pschleck.743616963@cwis>.EDU  
Reply-To : wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J Turner)  
Subject : Re: Lead the Way! (was Re: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for  
Code vs.

As much as Paul and I disagree on many things (not necessarily in this group,  
though) I do agree with him here.

Back before I passed my code, I was exclusively on 2 meters, and the reason was  
that that was the only band (other than HF) that I had been exposed to. If you  
want the Techs to go to other bands, help make those other bands popular, or go  
there yourself. It won't happen on its own.

Here in Des Moines, the 2 meter band is *\*not\** very crowded, and I have yet to  
hear an obvious CB transplant. I have heard people who did come from CB to ham  
radio, but the only way I could tell was that they *\*told\** me.

The one thing I am thankful for is that I have not heard many people here  
complain about the Technician class license. Except for the odd "I'm an Extra,  
and I've been in ham radio for a whole year, so I'm an expert", I haven't hear  
anyone say the FCC shouldn't have done it. In my opinion, this positive  
attitude has helped make the bands a nice place to hang out--at least better  
than what some places sound like.

--  
Will Turner, NORDV -----  
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |  
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |  
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #261  
\*\*\*\*\*